

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending with claims 1, 16 and 22-25 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 16 have been amended. Claims 22-25 have been added. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

In the July 13, 2005 Office Action, independent claims 1 and 16, and dependent claims 2-15 and 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,374,112 (“*Widegren*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,729,532 (“*Bales*”). For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully assert that all claims of the present application are patentable over the cited references.

Widegren relates to providing a wide variety of mobile communications services and allocating resources to support those services (see col. 1, lines 10-12). *Widegren* (col. 2, lines 49-53) states, a Universal Mobile Telephone System (UMTS) Terrestrial Radio Access Network (UTRAN) responds to radio access bearer service requests with a flexible and efficient allocation of the resources needed to support communications with a mobile radio. *Widegren* (col. 2, lines 53-58) teaches that the UTRAN includes plural base stations for communicating with mobile radios over a radio air interface using radio channel resources allocated by a radio network controller connected to the base stations. External network service nodes interfaced with external networks communicate with mobiles via the UTRAN. When one of the service nodes requires communication with a mobile radio, the service node requests a radio access bearer from the UTRAN rather than a specific radio channel resource (see col. 2, lines 58-61).

The Office Action (pg. 3) states:

Regarding claims 1 and 16, *Widegren* discloses a method and system for controlling bearer properties.

...
information specifying said set of allowed transport format combinations (TFCS) is communicated to the receiver for construction of said set of allowed transport format combinations (TFCS) at the receiver (see col. 3, lines 16-21, UTRAN dynamically assigned radio access bearers to UTRAN transport and radio channel resources based on quality of service parameters from the radio access bearer request which is the mobile station).

Widegren does not expressly disclose *a set of allowed transport format combinations (TFCS) is constructed, a transport format combination (TFC) being a combination of transport formats (TF) of a plurality of bearers.*

Bales discloses *a set of allowed (valid users to be able to make conference calls) transport formation combinations (TFCS) is*

reconstructed, a transport format combination (TFC) being a combination of transport formats (TF) of a plurality of bearers (Fig. 15, see col. 20, lines 21-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time invention was made, to employ the multimedia conference call as taught by Bales into Widegren's invention to arrive at the claimed invention as specified in claims 1 and 16.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide an efficient bandwidth allocation in telecommunication system in order to maximize the bandwidth conservation of the communication system (see col. 1, line 57 – col. 2, line 2).

With respect to the foregoing statement, the following is noted. *Widegren* (col. 3, lines 7-9) states, radio access bearers are dynamically assigned to UTRAN transport and radio channel resources by the UTRAN. *Widegren* (col. 3, lines 9-11) teaches that the radio access bearer service and the UTRAN isolate the details of transport and radio resource allocation handling as well as details of radio control, e.g., soft handoff. *Widegren* (col. 3, lines 16-21) teaches that the external network service node only needs to request a radio access bearer service over a RAN interface to the UTRAN along with a specific quality of service for a communication to a specific mobile radio, where the UTRAN provides the requested service at the requested quality of service (if possible). That is, *Widegren* (col. 3, lines 16-21) describes how the UTRAN may dynamically allocate a bearer with a preferred quality of service (QoS) upon request. *Widegren* (col. 3, lines 22-28) also teaches how plural bearers can be established/released independently and/or multiplexed onto the same channel. In short, *Widegren* (col. 3, lines 1-65) relates to dynamic, "real-time" bearer allocation on request. However, *Widegren* fails to teach the claimed step of "communicating information specifying [a] set of allowed transport format combinations (TFCS) toward the receiver for construction of said set of allowed transport format combinations (TFCS) at the receiver," as recited in amended independent claim 1.

The TFCS recited in independent claim 1 includes all possible/allowed (e.g., currently active and inactive) TFC combinations that may be used in the future. This is not equivalent to a real-time requested single bearer that is more similar to a transport format (TF), as taught in *Widegren*. As a result, the method of claim 1 enables later dynamic bearer property adjustments/bearer allocations by simply signalling the TFC IDs (TFCI), which is advantageously more efficient (i.e., permits rapid control of all resources relating to a single mobile) than the burdensome dynamic parameter determination proposed in *Widegren*.

The Examiner cites *Bates* in an attempt to cure the shortcomings of *Widegren*, i.e., the failure to teach the construction of TCFSSs. *Bates* (col. 1, lines 59-61) teaches a telecommunications terminal that can continuously vary the type of media it receives during a multimedia communication conference call. *Bates* (col. 1, lines 61-64) states, in response to inputs from a user, the telecommunication terminal can vary the type of media by increasing, decreasing, or changing the bandwidth of the call. *Bates* (col. 1, line 64 to col. 2, line 2) further states, a telecommunication terminal controlling the multimedia communication conference call is informed of changes being made by the telecommunication terminal on the conference call and informs remaining telecommunication terminals of changes in user participation of the telecommunication terminal. Put differently, *Bates* teaches a conference call system that may be configured “on-the-fly” based on a terminal’s requirement, i.e. the receiving terminal may request from the host terminal and intermediary switches to only receive parts of a total multimedia transmission in order to conserve transfer resources (and money) until needed.

However, the combination of *Bates* and *Widegren* fails to achieve the invention recited in independent method claim 1. *Bates* (col. 20, lines 21-59) teaches the physical merging of signal transports into a single call. *Bates* (col. 20, lines 23-26) teaches that call ID’s are separate (CRNs). *Bates* (col. 20, lines 35-40) teaches the creation of a merge record 1502. This merge record 1502 is more akin to a transport format combination (TFC). It is not analogous to Applicant’s allowed transport format combinations (TFCS), as recited in independent claim 1. Moreover, the configuration for the single TFC (i.e., the alleged merge record) is performed in *Bates* “on-the-fly”, whereas in the present claimed invention “information specifying [a] set of allowed transport format combinations (TFCS) [is communicated toward a] receiver for construction of [the] set of allowed transport format combinations (TFCS) at the receiver. In the present invention, this TFCS is constructed for further non-real time use. Consequently, *bates* fails to provide what *Widegren* lacks. As a result, independent method claim 1 is patentable over the combination of *Widegreen* and *Bates* and therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is in order, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Independent claim 16 and new dependent claims 22-25 are apparatus claims associated with the implementation of independent method claim 1. Accordingly, independent claims 16 and 22-25 are patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to the combination of *Widegren* and *Bates*.

In view of the patentability of independent claims 1, 16 and 22-25, for the reasons set forth above, dependent claims 2-15 and 17-21 are all patentable over the prior art.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should be in condition for allowance. Early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By 

Michael C. Stuart

Reg. No. 35,698

551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210

New York, New York 10176

(212) 687-2770

Dated: October 13, 2005